

23 December 1982

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chief, Recruitment Division
Chief, Staff Personnel Division

FROM: Deputy Director for Recruitment and Placement

SUBJECT: HN Request for Deescalation of the PAR Ratings

REFERENCE:

STAT

1. We all realize that it is difficult to shift downward to a more accurate numerical rating. We must try.

2. I would estimate that the average rating for the past year in R&P was around 5.4. I would expect that if we follow reference, it would drop to 4.5. Since we have a number of PARs in the various stages of preparation, it may be wise to comment on in the PAR when using the tighter standards. Reviewing officials should feel free to reevaluate the numerical standards even though the PAR was originally written with the inflated ratings. Should rating officers and reviewing officials not utilize the tighter standards, I would expect appropriate comments on the routing sheets from the next reviewing level.

STAT

3. Let's give it a try. We will monitor other areas of Personnel to make sure that the lower ratings are reasonably uniform in the Career Service.

STAT

STAT

ROUTING AND TRANSMITTAL SLIP

TO: (Name, office symbol, room number, building, Agency/Post)		Initials	Date
1. EA D/Pers		6 JAN 1983	1/6
2.			
3. DD/Pers 6 JAN 1983			
4.			
5. D/Pers			
Action	File	Note and Return	
Approval	For Clearance	Per Conversation	
As Requested	For Correction	Prepare Reply	
Circulate	For Your Information	See Me	
Comment	Investigate	Signature	
Coordination	Justify		

REMARKS

FYI

Re: PAR

As I have mentioned at
4 o'clock last Tuesday

DO NOT use this form as a RECORD of approvals, concurrences, disposals, clearances, and similar actions

FROM: (Name, org. symbol, Agency/Post)	Room No.—Bldg.
DD/R&P	Phone No.

NOTE FOR: Director of Personnel

FROM:

STAT

1. You will see ~~from~~ ^{that} the attached questions, which you should answer at the next Personnel Officers Meeting, reflect deep concern about the DDCI's Headquarters Notice on performance appraisals.

2. I will continue to believe that there is nothing in John's Notice that says employees deserving 5's or 6's or 7's should not get such ratings. After all, we wrote this Notice and there is a phrase in paragraph 2 that I think is being misunderstood. The statement is that the DDCI intends that level 4 of the PAR be applied strictly. That same paragraph goes on to say in effect that higher ratings can be supplied but that the narrative has to describe those accomplishments that merit the higher rating.

3. If in fact Pete and in turn and others have said that a 4 is the "norm", I can see the concern. I know some officers in Pete's area who even under the tighter standard will deserve a 5 or 6 and that these higher ratings can be justified.

STAT

4. What we are trying to do is to resurrect rating 4 from the pejorative status to one to communicate a positive evaluation and I urge you next week to try to assure our top performers that they are not going to become part of a homogenized group ~~on~~ rated at the 4 level.

STAT



Page Denied

Next 1 Page(s) In Document Denied